

January 27, 1976

of this bill. He indicates to me his primary concern is sanitation and utility connection, and the Mobile Home Institute has expressed their support of the amendments that I am presenting to you. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendments to LB 91 which I have offered.

PRESIDENT: Senator Simpson.

SENATOR SIMPSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would just acknowledge that I do agree with the amendments by Senator Bereuter. My personal concern is with where most of the problems are and that is in the hookups in the parks. Under this we could have them proper. They would be safe and the conditions would be sanitary. It also would comply with the enforcement program which is recommended and encouraged by HUD as to the installation of the mobile homes on the site. The federal government does have a fee on the manufacturers which can come back to the State Department of Health to help in the operation of this bill and so I would hope that we could adopt the amendments and so pass on the bill.

PRESIDENT: Further discussion? The question is the adoption of Senator Bereuter's amendments to the bill. Record your vote. Please vote. Have you voted? Record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 2 nays.

PRESIDENT: Senator Simpson.

SENATOR SIMPSON: Mr. President, I move to advance LB 91 as amended. I think that we primarily set the tone of the bill in the amendments now that it has to do with compliance with certain qualifications in order to have proper hookups and the intent is to make sure that the gas lines and electric lines and sewer lines and water, that everything is done in a safe and sanitary condition and this would allow that that would happen. To that, I just wish that we would advance the bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dickinson.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, would Senator Simpson yield to a question, please? Senator Simpson, would you yield to a question? Is this going to create any duplication of inspections, licenses of courts and so forth in regard to municipalities and counties that already have regulations equal to or more stringent than those required here?

SENATOR SIMPSON: No, there would be no duplication in the areas where they did have, and we are taking jurisdiction, why they would continue on that basis in co-operation with the State Department of Health, but the locals would do the licensing and the enforcement.

SENATOR DICKINSON: They would still...the State Department would have authority to supercede that local entity. What is the fiscal...is there a fiscal impact here? Is this going to require additional employees in the State Department of Health?